IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

FRIDAY, THE 7TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 16TH BHADRA 1929

WP(C).No. 20079 of 2007(M)

PETITIONER:

---

1. C.V.THOMAS, S/O. VARKEY, AGED 51 YEARS, GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT CHERUMADATHIL HOUSE, NEAR RAILWAY STATION, ANGAMALI P.O., ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

2. T.V.JOSE, S/O. VARGHESE, AGED 52 YEARS, GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT THETTAYIL HOUSE, KAVARAPARAMBU, NAYATHODU P.O., (VIA)ANGAMALI, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

3. C.P.THOMAS, S/O. PATHROSE, AGED 54 YRS, GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT CHERUMADATHIL HOUSE, NEAR CHURCH, THURAVOOR P.O., ANGAMALI (VIA), ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

4. A.D.JOSEPH, S/O. DEVASSIA, AGED 53 YRS, GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT ARAKKAL HOUSE, NEAR CHURCH, THURAVOOR P.O., (VIA) ANGAMALI, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

5. A.V.DEVASSIKUTTY, S/O. VAREETH, AGED 49 YEARS, GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT ARAKKAL HOUSE, VALAVAZHI JUNCTION, P.O.ANGAMALI, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

6. K.V.THOMAS, S/O. VAREETH, AGED 53 YRS, GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT KOTTAYKA HOUSE, NEAR MANIYANKULAM, P.O.ANGAMALI, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

7. T.V.THOMAS, S/O. VARGHESE, AGED 54 YRS,
GODOWN WORKER, CENTRAL DEPOT., ANGAMALY,
KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION, RESIDING AT
THEKKINEDATH HOUSE, NEAR ST.JOSEPH HIGH SCHOOL,
P.O.ANGAMALI, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.M.SASINDRAN

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. THE KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION,
REPRESENTED BY MANAGING DIRECTOR, HEAD OFFICE,
ANGAMALI SOUTH, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

2. THE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
CENTRAL GODOWN, KERALA STATE BAMBOO CORPORATION,
HEAD OFFICE, ANGAMALI SOUTH, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

3. STATE OF KERALA - REPRESENTED BY
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.B.S.KRISHNAN (SR.)
SMT.LATHA KRISHNAN
SRI. K. ANAND, SC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 07/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V. GIRI , J

==========

W.P.(C) NO. 20079 OF 2007

==========

Dated this the 7th day of September, 2007.

JUDGMENT

The petitioners are godown workers in the service of the Kerala State Bamboo Corporation. The grievance originally highlighted in the writ petition related to their deployment. According to them, such deployment resulted in denial of work to them. They also raised a grievance that they are being compelled to incur additional expenditure on account of being required to travel long distance for work. Apparently, if there is dearth of work in the Central Depot, it cannot be said that the management is not justified in deploying the labourers to other depots. At any rate, management of the resources available is a matter which falls within the domain of the management itself. If there is dispute regarding denial of work, that obviously is the matter which could be effectively raised as an industrial dispute and grievances redressed under the Industrial Dispute Act.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that though the petitioners have accepted the deployment due to exigency of service, the additional allowances which the management has sanctioned is not disbursed. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that some

workers are alloted to Bamboo Board Factories and such workers are granted additional allowances.

3. Apparently, the petitioners have sought for similar allowances. The question as to whether the workers who are allotted to Bamboo Board Factory are discharging any special duties and whether they are entitled to any special allowances by reason of allotment to the Bamboo Board Factory are matters which are to be looked into by the management. At any rate, it is not the grievance which is highlighted in the writ petition. It is open to the petitioner to move the management if there is any grievance in that regard. The learned Standing Counsel for the Corporation assures that if any such representation is filed it will be considered in accordance with law and appropriate decision will be taken.

Subject to the above observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

V. GIRI, JUDGE.

rv